

d) Remarks

Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 21-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 8 and 21-23 are independent. Claims 1-4, 8 and 21-23 have been allowed.

In the Office Action, Claims 5-7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Lu U.S. Patent 5,444,958 ("Lu"). The rejection is respectfully traversed as follows.

Referring to FIG. 2 of the present invention, a rail system is provided for securing a pane 101, wherein the pane 101 defines a first plane. Nut 108 is threadably engaged with a screw 106 such that tightening screw 106 to drive a pair of clamp members 104a,104b in a direction along the first plane in order to generate a clamping force between the clamp members. When the clamp members are driven along the first plane, contact is created between inclined surfaces 122 of clamp members 104a,104b and inclined surfaces 120 of housing 102. This contact between inclined surfaces 120,122 is sufficient to secure the pane between clamp members 104a,104b.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite that driving the clamp members in a direction along the first plane "generates sufficient contact between the inclined surfaces to secure the pane between the pane clamping surface of the first clamp member and the pane clamping surface of the second clamping member". Lu does not teach a screw and nut combination that drives a pair of clamp members in direction along a plane defined by the pane such that contact is created between inclined surfaces. Referring to Lu, Figures 6 and 7, it is apparent that by driving the clamp members 71,72 along a plane defined by the pane (i.e., downward), contact is generated between non-inclined surfaces rather than the inclined surfaces. Further, as required by amended Claim 5, the contact between inclined surfaces must be sufficient to secure the pane between the pane clamping surface of the first clamp member and the pane clamping surface of the second clamping member".

In view of the above, the rejection of Claims 5-7 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b), has been traversed.

In the Office Action, Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Boeckx. The rejection is respectfully traversed as follows. Lu is distinguished from these claims for the reasons noted above with respect to Claim 5. Boeckx fails to cure the deficiencies of Lu. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been traversed.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection has been traversed as to the independent claims and all claims depending from them, and that the application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss remaining issues, if there are any.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this and concurrent replies to charge payment (or credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 50-2298 for any additional fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

11/17/2003
Date



David E. Heisey
Attorney for Applicant(s)
c/o LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON
& SCRIPPS LLP
11988 El Camino Real, Ste. 200
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone No.: (858) 720-6300